

**AMENDMENTS TO THE ABSTRACT**

Please substitute the following paragraph for the abstract now appearing in the currently filed specification:

--The invention relates generally to a method of using multiple URL names to identify a first individual, within an Internet connected application executing on a processor. The method involves providing the multiple URL names to multiple domain name servers, where each of the URL names includes a third level domain name and a second level domain name, the third level domain name being a representation of a name of the first individual, where at least one of the plurality of URL names has a file suffix. The method further involves providing a first profile, a second profile, and a third profile of web page(s) accessible using Internet http addressing. The method further involves inputting, on a local machine, the first URL name, the second URL name, and the third URL name into the Internet connected application to obtain an inputted first URL name, an inputted second URL name, and an inputted third URL name, deriving at least one identity of the first individual based on the third level domain names and the second level domain names of the inputted first URL name, and the inputted second URL name, consolidating, following the deriving, data associated with the first profile, the second profile, and the third profile according to the at least one identity to obtain consolidated data. The method further involves displaying the consolidated data together with at least the inputted first URL name and the inputted second URL name.--

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application and for participating in the Applicant Initiated Examiner Interview on September 10, 2008.

**Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1, 3-5, and 12-32 were pending in the present application. By way of this submission, claims 26 and 27 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Of the still pending claims, claims 1, 28, and 31 are independent. The remaining claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 28, and 31.

**Claim Amendments**

By way of this submission, claims 1, 16, 22, 28, 29, and 31 are amended for clarification, and claims 26 and 27 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant respectfully asserts no new matter has been introduced by way of these amendments as support for these amendments may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0292]-[0301] (including Tables 4-5) and [0307]-[0312] (including Tables 7-9) of the published specification, the corresponding drawings (including Figures 4, 12, and 14), and the originally filed claims.

**Abstract Amendment**

By way of this submission, the abstract is amended to reflect the claim amendments. Applicant respectfully asserts no new matter has been introduced by way of these amendments as support for these amendments may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0292]-[0301] (including Tables 4-5) and [0307]-[0312] (including Tables 7-9) of the published specification, the corresponding drawings (including Figures 4, 12, and 14), and the originally filed claims.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1, 3-5, and 12-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner rejects the claims as generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. *See* Action at page 2. Further, the Examiner contends the claims are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. *Id.*

By way of this submission, claims 1, 22, 28, 29, and 31 are amended to clarify the invention. Also, claims 26 and 27 are cancelled, so the rejection is moot as to those claims. To the extent the rejection applies to the remaining claims, Applicant asserts the rejection is traversed.

Applicant asserts that the amended claims of the response filed by the Applicant on October 5, 2007<sup>1</sup> (hereinafter “Response”), conformed to current U.S. practice and are patentable in view of 35 U.S.C. § 112 for at least the reasons cited on page 2 of the Response. With the further clarification provided by the currently amended claims provided with this submission and the Examiner Interview on September 10, 2008, Applicant asserts that amended independent claims 1, 28, and 31 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention. Claims 3-5, 12-25, 29, 30, and 32, depend directly from independent claims 1, 28, and 31 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

---

<sup>1</sup> And also the response to non-compliant amendment filed December 17, 2008

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 3-5, and 12-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,062,561 (hereinafter “Reisman”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,072,984 (hereinafter “Polonsky”). Claims 26 and 27 are cancelled, so the rejection is moot as to those claims. To the extent the rejection applies to the remaining amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth below.

MPEP § 2143 states that “[t]he key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in *KSR* noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should be made explicit.” If the Examiner does not produce a *prima facie* case, Applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of non-obviousness. The initial evaluation of *prima facie* obviousness thus relieves both the Examiner and Applicant from evaluating evidence beyond the prior art and the evidence in the specification as filed until the art has been shown to suggest the claimed invention. *See*, MPEP § 2142.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, in part, (i) deriving at least one identity of the first individual based on the third level domain names and the second level domain names of the inputted first URL name and the inputted second URL name; (ii) consolidating, following the deriving, data associated with the first profile, the second profile, and the third profile according to the at least one identity to obtain consolidated data; and (iii) displaying, through the Internet connected application, the consolidated data together with at least the inputted first URL name and the inputted second URL name.” Further, inputting the first URL name and the second URL name into an Internet

connected application is performed on a *local* machine. Amended independent claims 28 and 31 recite similar limitations. As recited in the claims, the identity is derived based on defined (*i.e.*, not heuristic) information; specifically, the identity is derived based on the third level domain names and the second level domain names of the inputted first URL and the inputted second URL name. Further, the consolidated data together with at least the inputted first URL name and inputted second URL name (which are input on a local machine) are displayed on the Internet connected application.

Reisman, in contrast, discloses a heuristic, feedback, and probabilistic basis of determining (*i.e.*, deriving) names. *See, e.g.*, Reisman at column 3, lines 25-35 and Abstract. Further, Reisman is designed based on “perceived relationship...which need not be exact...” *See, e.g.*, Reisman at column 5, lines 12-16. In essence, Reisman derives identities from a heuristic database containing a history of collaborative users’ input and feedback and the usage of an entire *global* search engine (*i.e.*, not locally). Accordingly, Reisman fails to teach amended limitations (i)-(iii) listed above or the fact that the URL names are input to a *local* machine and displayed to the device running the Internet connected application.

Accordingly, Reisman’s heuristic, feedback, and probabilistic basis of determining names and usage of an entire *global* search engine cannot be equivalent to limitations (i)-(iii) listed above as recited by amended claims.

Further, Polonsky does not provide what Reisman lacks as Polonsky is used to by the Examiner to disclose the organization of profiles dealing with the URL names specifically and a way to normalize data generally. *See*, Action at page 3-6. The Examiner contends it would be

obvious to combine the teaching of Reisman with the teaching of Polonsky in order to limit bandwidth usage and provide the user with the appropriately intended content which the user wanted to access. *See*, Action at page 3. Applicants respectfully note that the motivation provided by the Examiner actually reinforces that Polonsky is not a proper reference to teach the recited claims. The motivation provided is based on limiting bandwidth issues. In the recited claims, the consolidated data together with at least the inputted first URL name and inputted second URL name are input on a **local** machine—bandwidth usage is not an issue.

In view of the above, the Examiner's contentions do not support the rejection of amended independent claim 1, 28, and 31. Claims 3-5, 12-25, 29, 30, and 32 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 28, and 31. Thus, the Examiner's contentions also do not support a rejection of claims 3-5, 12-25, 29, 30, and 32. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 32240/004001).

Dated: September 23, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert P. Lord/

Robert P. Lord  
Registration No.: 46,479  
OSHA · LIANG LLP  
3945 Freedom Circle, Suite 300  
Santa Clara, California 95054  
(408) 727-0600  
(408) 727-8778 (Fax)  
*Attorney for Applicant*